(1)

Single Bench

CF 100 L

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, AT- BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (S) NO. 6910 OF 2006

PETITIONER : N. P. CHOUDHARY,
AGED – 54 YEARS,
SON OF LATE N. K. CHOUDHARY
POSTED AS – DISTRICT AUDITOR,
AT – O/O JOINT DIRECTOR
(PANCHAYAT & SOCIAL WELFARE
DEPARTMENT, BILASPUR,
R/O KUDUDAND, BILASPUR,
DISTRICT – BILASPUR (C. G.)

P.R. No. 6458/06
Presented by Shri R.K. Kacharewal
dated 13/11/06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :

1. STATE OF CHHATTISGARH,
THROUGH – THE SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL
WELFARE ,
D. K. S. BHAWAN, RAIPUR

2. THE DIRECTOR,
PANCHAYAT & SOCIAL WELFARE
DEPARTMENT, CHHATTIGARH,
H. Q. – MAHANADI KHAND,
RAIPUR.

3. STATE OF CHHATTISGARH,
THROUGH – THE SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF PANCHAYAT &
RURAL DEVELOPMENT, D. K. S.
BHAWAN, RAIPUR.

RECEIVED-COPY
17/11/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

Writ Petition Under Article – 226 & ~~227~~ of Constitution of India

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर 99

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक WP(S) 6410/2006 **सन्** **200**

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	29-11-2006 Shri R.K. Kesharwani, counsel for the petitioner. Smt. Anju Ahuja, Dy. Govt. Advocate for the State/respondents. Heard. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the departmental enquiry initiated against the petitioner has taken a long time and still final order has not been passed. He further contended that the petitioner was on deputation, but information regarding departmental enquiry has not been given by the borrowing authority to the authority who lent his services. From the papers annexed along with the petition and pleading, it is clear that disciplinary authority agreeing with the report of enquiry has served second notice proposing punishment to the petitioner who not only replied the show cause notice, but also participated in personal hearing. It appears that the proceedings are at fag end. So far as non-furnishing of information to the parent department is concerned, petitioner concedes that he has already raised the said issue in his enquiry. After final order the petitioner has right to appeal. The grounds raised in the course of arguments are not substantial enough to interfere with the enquiry proceedings by stepping in Article 226 of the Constitution of India. However, if exigency arises the petitioner shall be at liberty to take recourse in future. In view of the above, the petition is liable to be dismissed and is accordingly dismissed. Consequently, M.(W.).P.No.4700 of 2006 stands disposed of. **Sd/-** **V.K.Shrivastava** **Judge**	
Gowri		

(पीछे देखिये)

1-12-06 07/12/06